

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action of March 25, 2005, claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 14 and 17 have been amended, claims 2 and 12 have been cancelled and claims 22-31 have been added. For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance.

Referring to paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention as claimed. Specific reference is made to electric components recited in claim 1. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite an “electronic” device rather than an “electric” device and “electronic” components rather than “electric” components. Support for this amendment is found in the original specification, including page 10, line 35 through page 11, line 5 where “electronic device 20” is defined with reference to Figure 1 and further on page 11, lines 22-25 wherein it states that electronics are implemented in the main casing and in the top casing, which are the two casing parts recited in claims 1 and 11. As such, the drawings do show every feature of the invention specified in the claims and therefore compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) is believed to be met.

Referring now to paragraph 3 of the Official Action, the Abstract has been amended in a manner to overcome the objection raised by the Examiner and to ensure that the phraseology used therein is in conformance with the remainder of the specification.

Referring now to paragraph 4 of the Official Action, claims 4, 7, 14 and 17 were objected to for various informalities. The informalities regarding claims 4 and 14 have been corrected in a manner as suggested by the Examiner. With regard to claims 7 and 17, these claims should be dependent respectively on claims 6 and 16 and as such, the recitation to “said brackets” does find proper antecedent basis.

Referring now to paragraph 6 of the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-21 as anticipated in view of US patent 6,437,973, Helot et al (hereinafter Helot). The Examiner states that Helot discloses a hinge mechanism which comprises at least a hinge body component, a flexible electrical conductor means and wherein the hinge body component provides two pivot

axes which are separated at a predefined distance and that the hinge body component provides a passage for accepting the flexible electrical conductor means. Helot does in fact disclose an articulated hinge mechanism which is interposed between a computer base and a display by means of mechanical connectors, wherein the articulated hinge mechanism 36 as shown in Figures 1 and 2 thereof includes a first arm member 42 and a second arm member 52. Helot in fact discloses three pivot mechanisms, a first pivot mechanism 27 located on articulated mechanism 36 for interconnecting first arm member 42 and a rear edge 26 of computer base 22. A second pivot mechanism 47 located on display 28 is interconnected with second arm member 52 and a bottom edge 34 of display 28. The arm members 42 and 52 are pivotally coupled at a third pivot mechanism 57. As set forth in Helot at column 4, lines 24-32, rotation of the second arm member 52 about third pivot axis 57A allows the display 28 to assume a large number of spatial positions relative to computer base 22. In fact, of the three pivot axes shown in Figure 1 of Helot (27a, 47a and 57a), pivot axis 47a is in fact the axis associated with opening and closing of the device (see column 4, lines 24-32). The pivot axis 27a and 57a are used to move the display according to user preference, either closer or farther away or higher or lower.

In contrast, in the present invention, the opening angle of the device (that is the total pivot angle for folding the casing parts), is the summation of the individual pivot angles about each of which said respective pivot axis is pivoted. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate this limitation of the present invention and as such, it is respectfully submitted that Helot neither discloses nor suggests this inventive aspect of the present invention.

As a result of this amendment, claim 2 has been cancelled.

Similar amendment has been made to claim 11 and as a result, claim 12 has been cancelled.


Since independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended in a manner which is believed to distinguish these claims from Helot, it is respectfully submitted that the remaining dependent claims (claims 3-10, ultimately dependent from claim 1 and claims 13-21, ultimately dependent from claim 11) are further distinguished over Helot.

Newly submitted independent claim 22 is directed to a hinge mechanism for a folding casing of an electronic device consisting of at least two casing parts, each of the casing parts including electronic components, wherein the hinge mechanism comprises at least a hinge body component and a flexible electrical conductor means for connecting said electronic components included by different casing parts, wherein the hinge body component is specified as generally U-shaped forming two legs so as to provide two pivot axes at the end of each leg, the two pivot axes being separated at a predefined distance, wherein each of the pivot axes is disposed on one of the two casing parts and wherein the hinge body component provides a passage for accepting said flexible electrical conductor means. Such a shape for the hinge body component is clearly seen in Figure 2a of the application as originally filed and is thoroughly discussed in the specification as filed, including page 11, line 33 through page 12, line 36. Clearly, Helot does not disclose or suggest such a shape for a hinge body component wherein this hinge body component provides two pivot axes which are separated at a predefined distance and wherein each of the pivot axes is disposed on one of the two casing parts and further wherein the hinge body component provides a passage for accepting the flexible electrical conductor means.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 22 and dependent claims 23-31 are also neither anticipated nor suggested by Helot.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Alfred A. Fressola
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 27,550

Dated: June 6, 2005

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955